

IN THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA]
(Fictitious Party)]
Plaintiff]
]
v.] Case No. 4:10-cr-00131-FJG-1
] (Cestui Que (Vie) Trust)
Denny-Ray: Hardin, sui juris]
(Real Party of Interest)]
Beneficiary]

Answer to Plaintiff's suggestions in opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss

Comes Now, Denny-Ray: Hardin, sui juris, as an American National born in the Republic of Missouri within the Republic of the United States of America as a "Beneficiary" of the Cestui Que (vie) Trust also known as the "Constitution for the united States of America". Magistrate Robert E. Larsen clearly stated on May 27, 2011, that Defendant must comply with the "Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure" and no special treatment would be given. It appears Denny-Ray: Hardin has complied with the Rules, but Prosecutor Brian Casey is allowed to violate the same Rule at will, without accountability.

In (Document 88) in the "Argument" section on page two, contends Rules 3 and 4 do not apply and that a Complaint is not required only a Grand Jury Indictment, Of course this satisfies

the 5th Amendment, but not the 4th requiring probable cause signed under penalty of perjury for issuance of warrants. As well as the 6th Amendment to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; The Indictment is not signed under oath and no complaining party is identified. Every witness Mr.Casey calls must sign a complaint to be established as an injured party. Of course that is for "Common law Jurisdiction" or every party must produce a "Contract" for "Admiralty Jurisdiction". Neither are present.

On page 2, second paragraph, Mr.Casey again refuses to state the Jurisdiction for the Court to proceed with this cause of action. The "Motion to Dismiss" clearly challenged "Subject-Matter Jurisdiction" and "Personal Jurisdiction" for lack of complaint. Rather than state the jurisdiction of the Court, on the record, in accordance with law. Mr.Casey continues to evade, ignore, delay, deny and dismiss his lawful responsibility to establish Jurisdiction for this court.

Mr.Casey goes on to page 3 to say Denny-Ray: Hardin does not have the substantive right to challenge the array of the grand jury under Rule 6 (b) (1). If the ability to challenge was not provided Denny-Ray: Hardin has the Right to "Motion to Dismiss" under 6 (b)(2). Since Mr.Casey is such a stickler for facts to be stated, I have now had served 41 Jurisdictional Statements that must be answered within 3 days, by "Affidavit" signed by him under the penalty of perjury. His failure to establish jurisdiction is a matter of public record of the Court's failure to require jurisdiction clearly shows Treason and Mandamus will be sought.

Conclusion

Brian Casey has had over a year to establish personal, subject-matter and territorial jurisdiction in this cause of action. By Magistrate Robert E. Larsen utilizing his "Public Office" to inflict injuries upon Denny-Ray: Hardin and his family, clear denial of due process of law is evident. Brian Casey has delayed these proceedings for far too long with his avoidance of jurisdiction challenges. It is time he put up or shut up.

Statement of Truth

The foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and beliefs under the penalty of perjury. The right to amend is reserved for the truth to be clearly stated.

"FOR THE RECORD, I SWEAR TO INNOCENCE BEFORE MY CREATOR."



Denny-Ray: Hardin, Sui Juris

All rights reserved UCC1-308

Formally UCC1-207